III. REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamauchi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,649,102), hereafter "Yamauchi" in view of Hayashi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,649,102), hereafter "Hayashi."

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action mailed by the Office is incomplete. Applicants' amendment of February 17, 2005 in response to the Office Action dated November 17, 2004 included three new claims, claims 14-17. The Office did not address these claims in the Final Office Action dated June 10, 2005. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office provide a new paper that indicates the status of these claims and withdraw the finality of the rejection.

With initial regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Yamauchi in view of Hayashi, Applicants continue to assert that there is no motivation for combining the references. Specifically, no reasonable intrinsic or extrinsic justification exists for the proposed combination. In Yamauchi, access to shared data is granted to a particular computer by transferring ownership of the shared data to the computer for a period of time. Col 20, lines 1-5. During this time the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PAGE 10/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

owning computer in Yamauchi has complete control of the data and other computers needing access to the data are suspended. Col. 20, lines 1-10. When the computer has completed its use of the data and an ACQUIRE command has been received from another computer, the computer transfers ownership of the data to the other computer. Col. 20, lines 17-19. In contrast, Hayashi teaches two ways of ensuring the integrity of a shared resource, shared processing in which all of the processors symmetrically perform the processing of the integrity guarantee and local processing in which only one processor module assigned to the resource performs the processing of the integrity guarantee. Col. 5, lines 7-19. These two states in Hayashi are toggled depending on whether access to the resource is evenly distributed or one processor dominates access. Col. 5, lines 25-38. As such, the transferred data ownership of Yamauchi is incompatible with the toggled integrity processing states of Hayashi. Furthermore, in Yamauchi "...there is no physical memory shared by the computers." Col. 8, lines 40-41. To this extent, Yamauchi teaches away from the shared memory that the Office asserts is provided in Hayashi. Accordingly, the Office has failed to prove a *prime facie* case of obviousness and Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

With further regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Yamauchi in view of Hayashi, Applicants assert that the combined features of the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 9, 11 and 12, Applicants submit that, contrary to the assertion of the Office, Hayashi fails to teach scope definitions for association with respective computer system resources to determine the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resources and for determining whether the computer system resources should be stored in said shared access memory, and for

PAGE 11/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied by reference to their associated scope definitions. The Office argues that the shared access control unit of Hayashi teaches this feature. Office Action, page 9. However, the shared access control unit of Hayashi merely converts between a shared processing operation and a local processing operation, manages and maintains the access state at each processor module and collects information to judge whether each resource is the object of the shared processing operation or the object of the local processing operation. Col. 7, lines 1-31. However, Hayashi never teaches that its toggling determines the scope of access and changes rights for the computer system resources; determines whether the computer system resources should be stored in shared access memory; and identifies computer system resources to which a command is to be applied. In contrast, the present invention includes "...scope definitions for association with respective computer system resources to determine the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resources and for determining whether the computer system resources should be stored in said shared access memory, and for identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied by reference to their associated scope definitions." Claim 1. As such, the scope definitions of the claimed invention do not merely toggle resource integrity guarantee modes as does Hayashi, but instead are used to determine the scope of access and change rights for computer system resources; to determine whether the computer system resources should be stored in shared access memory; and to identify computer system resources to which a command is to be applied. Thus, the scope definitions as included in the present invention are not equivalent to the toggling in Hayashi. Yamauchi does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

PAGE 12/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

With further respect to independent claim 1, and with respect to claims 8 and 10, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Office's assertion, Yamauchi fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, at least one command target qualifier indicating that a command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers. The Office argues that this feature is taught in Yamauchi by a combination of a description of a packet having a single destination computer field and a general statement that "[t]his packet is then transmitted to the computers having the corresponding shares data or to all computers." Col. 12, lines 10-23. However, these passages in Yamauchi merely teach that a number of instances of a packet each having a single source computer field are transmitted to computers having the corresponding shared data and does not teach an indicator that a command should be targeted to all members of the group located in the packet itself.

As further evidence that a single packet is sent to each computer, Yamauchi elsewhere teaches that its shared data identifier assigning unit "...generates a packet containing shared data, which is sent to *another* computer." Col. 9, lines 25-29. To this extent, a packet of Yamauchi is sent to only one other computer, meaning that the destination computer field does not target all members of a group. The present invention, in contrast, includes "...at least one command target qualifier indicating that a command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers." Claim 1. As such, in contrast to Yamauchi, the at least one command target qualifier of the claimed invention indicates whether a command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers. Thus, the packet in Yamauchi does not have a field that is equivalent to the at least one command target qualifier

PAGE 13/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

of the claimed invention. Hayashi does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claims 6, 9 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Office's statement, Yamauchi does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a command interface for a computer program for issuing commands for administration of the computer program. Instead, as stated above, the passage of Yamauchi cited by the Office teaches a packet that contains a number of fields. Col. 12, lines 10-23. However, Yamauchi teaches that its packets synchronize shared *data* and does not teach or suggest that they issue commands for *administration* of a computer program. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...[a] command interface for a computer program for issuing commands for administration of the computer program." Claim 6. As such, the command interface as included in the claimed invention is not merely used to synchronize shared data as are the packets in Yamauchi, but instead are for issuing commands for administration of the computer program. For the above reason, the command interface of the claimed invention is not equivalent to the packets of Yamauchi. Hayashi does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office's rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

PAGE 14/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2005

Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

PAGE 15/15 * RCVD AT 8/10/2005 4:15:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.